

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 14-17 have been canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 8-9, 13, 18-20 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Belvedere* in view of *Smith*.

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Belvedere* in view of *Smith* and further in view of *Lerner et al.*

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Belvedere* in view of *Pregozen et al.*

Claim 8 has been amended herein to recite the chemical agents in the bath, namely a solvent and an alkyl quaternary ammonium salt (as disclosed on page 2, lines 9-13). The Office Action had cited *Pregozen et al* as a basis for rejecting claims 14 and 15 (now canceled). It is submitted that although *Pregozen et al* disclose an N,N-dialkyl-N,N-di-lower-alkyl quaternary ammonium salt, the reference further states that three essential ingredients are required (column 4, lines 10-20). One of these ingredients is a lactic acid salt. The "surprising" anti-static results are not obtained using the quaternary ammonium salt alone without the lactic acid salt (column 9, line 67 through column 10, line 2). The present application does not require, nor does it use, the lactic acid salt. The reference teaches away from the present application and a person skilled in the art would not use only the quaternary ammonium salt. It is submitted, the cited reference is inappropriate as a basis for rejection of amended claim 8.

Claim 8 has been amended to recite:

" ... passing the substrate through an oven at elevated temperatures for curing the wiper/tack cloth ... ".

This is supported by the specification, page 3, lines 24-25 and FIG. 5.

The cited references do not disclose curing the impregnated substrate at an elevated temperature. *Belvedere* ('214) teaches a drying cabinet in which the cheesecloth is exposed to a stream of air by being passed around a series of staggered rolls (column 2, lines 58-64). Heating is not necessary due to the volatility and low flash points of the relatively volatile solvents (toluene, xylene, mineral spirits). The present application uses water as the solvent and because of the high water content, the tack cloth would not cure within a reasonable time without having a heated oven.

Claim 8 has further been amended to recite " ... squeezing the substrate under high pressure ... " as disclosed on page 3, lines 19-23. The Office Action noted that *Belvedere* did not teach squeeze rolls to remove excess chemicals but *Smith* taught pinch rollers. However, *Smith* does not teach that the rollers are under high pressure. Further the tack cloths of *Belvedere* and *Smith* are tacky and sticky (column 3, lines 69-70 and paragraph 0022 respectively) as opposed to the applicants' product which is not pressure sensitive (page 5, lines 12-14). The applicants' product is resin-free whereas *Belvedere* attributes the tackiness to the resin (column 3, lines 1-4) and *Smith* identifies the resin (paragraph 22). Thus, the applicants' product has unique properties due to the composition of the impregnating materials and the method of preparing the wiper/tack cloth.

Smith ('157) discloses that the chemical for treating the cloth fabric is a polybutene resin which originally is in a wax-like state and must be heated to 300°F to be in a molten state

(paragraph 0018). Contrary thereto, the present invention requires no heat for the chemical bath. It is an aqueous solution and the water would rapidly boil away at 300°F.

Claim 10 has been amended herein to delete "bath" and substitute therefore – oven -- .

Original claim 10 incorrectly recited "bath". The specification on page 3, lines 23-25 states that the substrate passes through an oven to cure the product. Nowhere in the specification is there an indication that the bath containing the treatment solution is at any temperature other than room temperature.

It is submitted that even if the cited references were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the resulting product would be sticky and would have different anti-static materials than the present invention. Further, the method of combining and treating the components is different from the present invention. Claims 9, 10-13 and 18-20 have not been further amended.

It was noted in reviewing the files, that the Patent Cooperation Treaty application was amended under Article 19 to have claims 1-25. In the Office Action of June 29, 2007 the restriction requirement identified only claims 1-20. A further restriction in the Office Action of March 11, 2008 also identified only claims 1-20. The applicants did not note this discrepancy when the elections were made.

Since elected Group II is directed to the method, and claims 21-25 are also directed to a method, it is requested that claims 21-25 be examined on the merits.

It appears that all matters have been addressed satisfactorily, and that the case is now in condition for a complete allowance; and the same is respectfully urged.



Serial No. 10/543,184
Docket No. 025127.001
Page 8

However, if the Examiner has any comments or questions, or has any suggestions as per MPEP 707.07 (d) and (j), for putting the case in condition for final allowance, he is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned attorney-of-record at the telephone number below, so that an expeditious resolution may be effected and the case passed to issue promptly.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

June 5, 2008



Robert M. Gamson
Reg. No. 32,986
Attorney for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMITTAL

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: June 5, 2008
Express Mail Label No. EB838394573US

By: 

Carolyn H. Bates

HODES, PESSIN & KATZ, P.A.
Department of Intellectual Property
901 Dulaney Valley Road, Suite 400
Towson, MD 21204
Phone: 410-769-6145
Fax: 410-832-5637
E-Mail: rgamson@hpklegal.com

RMG/chb

G:\files\GAMSON\ACE-TEX ENTERPRISES, INC\025127.001\PTO amendment.docx